

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,928	03/26/2004	Yuki Iseki	7372/80998	6764
42798 7590 07/07/2005 EXAMINER				INER
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY			LEE, RIP A	
P. O. BOX 65973 WASHINGTON, DC 20035			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DARED MURED
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713 .	
			DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/809,928	ISEKI ET AL.				
omos Action Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication con	Rip A. Lee	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
· <u></u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.	·_ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are objected to.						
_	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
The dati of declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action of form F 10-132.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-04-04, 10-28-04.	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				
t aper 110(s)(111a) - 240 - 11-04-04, 10-20-04.	U) L. J Outer:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 10/809,928

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities: The conditions for determining melt flow rate should be included in the claims since there are two commonly used standards. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/809,928 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kokubo *et al*.

Kokubo *et al.* teaches an copolymer derived from ethylene and 1-butene having an activation energy for melt flow of 78 kJ/mole, a MFR of 1 g/10 min, and a melt tension of 6.5 (see example 2). Thus, the MFR and E_a requirements set forth in the instant claims is met, as is the relationship between melt tension and melt flow rate, *i.e.*, equation (1). The reference is silent with respect to the remaining properties, however, in light of the fact that the copolymer is essentially the same as that recited in the claim, and in view of the fact that the principle rheological properties are essentially the same, a reasonable basis exists to believe that the polymer described in Kokubo *et al.* also exhibits the unrecited properties. Since the PTO can not conduct experiments, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to establish an unobviousness difference. *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d. 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed March 26, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list. Therefore, the references were not considered.

A new information disclosure statement was submitted on October 28, 2004 which cites the two references in the March IDS, as well as additional references. These references were not considered by the examiner because the IDS was not signed properly according to 37 C.F.R. 1.4(d)(2).

A third information disclosure statement was filed on November 4, 2004. The references have been initialized, and the IDS has been entered into the record.

Application/Control Number: 10/809,928

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rip A. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-1104. The examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571)272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

ral

February, 2005

DAVID W. WU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 4

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700